

E 340
.C6 L6
Copy 1

LIFE OF HENRY CLAY:

LIFE OF HENRY CLAY.

The Bank Question. His speech in 1811.

His illustrations and his arguments unanswered. His own sad apostasy.

On this subject we prefer quoting verbatim from Mr. Clay's Biography written by George D. Prentice, pages 54 to 60, viz.:

Mr. Clay's next considerable effort in the Senate was made in the following year, 1811, upon the question of renewing the charter of the old bank of the United States. He had been instructed by the Legislature of Kentucky to oppose the renewal, but he would have contented himself with giving a silent vote against it, had he not been incited to a more active opposition by the language of defiance which fell from the lips of the opposite party. The renewal of the charter was advocated by the whole body of the federalists, whom Mr. Clay denominated the "Macedonian phalanx," and William H. Crawford, and one or two other democrats, had, on this question, united with the opposition. Mr. Pope too, the colleague of Mr. Clay, made a long and able speech in favor of the bank, in direct violation of the instructions of the Legislature. The strength thus arrayed against Mr. Clay, might have intimidated an ordinary man, but he had learned his own powers too well to think, for a moment, of shrinking from the encounter.

Mr. Clay's remarks against the bank were principally confined to the subject of its unconstitutionality. His argument on this point was so replete with keen and powerful logic, that we choose to transfer it to our pages in his own words. Nothing equal to it can be found in any of the numerous discussions, which the bank question has called forth. He seemed to hold the strength of his antagonists in the hollow of his hands.

"This vagrant power to erect a bank, after having wandered throughout the whole constitution in quest of some congenial spot to fasten upon, has been, at length, located by the gentleman from Georgia on that provision which authorizes Congress to lay and collect taxes. In 1791, the power is referred to one part of the instrument; in 1811, to another.

Sometimes it is alleged to be deducible from the power to regulate commerce. Hard pressed here, it disappears, and shews itself under the grant to coin money." (1)

"What is the nature of this government? It is emphatically federal, vested with an aggregate of specified powers for general purposes, conceded by existing sovereignties, who have themselves retained what is not so conceded. It is said, that there are cases in which it must act on implied powers. This is not controverted, but the implication must be necessary, and obviously flow from the enumerated power with which it is allied. The power to charter companies is not specified in the grant, and, I contend, is of a nature not transferable by mere implication. It is one of the most exalted acts of sovereignty. In the exercise of this gigantic power, we have seen an East India Company erected, which has carried dismay, desolation, and death, throughout one of the largest portions of the habitable world. A company which is, in itself, a sovereignty—which has subverted empires, and set up new dynasties—and has not only made war, but war against its legitimate sovereign! Under the influence of this power, we have seen arise a South Sea Company and a Mississippi Company, that distracted and convulsed all Europe, and menaced a total overthrow of all credit and confidence, and universal bankruptcy. Is it to be imagined, that a power so vast would have been left by the constitution to doubtful inference? (2)

"It has been alleged, that there are many instances in the constitution, where powers, in their nature incidental, and which would necessarily have been vested along with the principal, are nevertheless expressly enumerated; and the power to make rules and regulations for the government of the land and naval forces, which, it is said, is incidental to the power to raise armies and provide a navy, is given as an example. What does this prove? How extremely cautious the convention were to leave as little as possible to implication. In all cases where incidental powers are acted upon, the principal and incidental ought to be congenial with each other, and partake of a common nature. The incidental power ought to be strictly subordinate and li-

mitted to the end proposed to be attained by the specified power. In other words, under the name of accomplishing one object, which is specified, the power implied ought not to be made to embrace other objects, which are not specified in the constitution. If, then, as is contended, you could establish a bank to collect and distribute the revenue, it ought to be expressly restricted to the purpose of such collection and distribution. It is mockery, worse than usurpation, to establish it for a lawful object, and then to extend it to other objects, which are not lawful. In deducing the power to create corporations, such as I have described it, from the power to collect taxes, the relation and condition of principal and incident are prostrated and destroyed. The accessory is exalted above the principal. As well might it be said, that the great luminary of day is an accessory, a satellite to the humblest star that twinkles forth its feeble light in the firmament of heaven."

"Suppose the constitution had been silent as to an individual department of this government—could you, under the power to lay and collect taxes, establish a judiciary? I presume not; but, if you could derive the power by mere implication, could you vest it with any other authority than to enforce the collection of the revenue? A bank is made for the ostensible purpose of aiding in the collection of the revenue, and, whilst it is engaged in this, the most inferior and subordinate of all its functions; it is made to diffuse itself throughout society, and to influence all the great operations of credit, circulation, and commerce. Like the Virginia justice, you tell the man, whose turkey had been stolen, that your books of precedents furnish no form for his case, but then you will grant him a precept to search for a cow, and, when looking for that, he may possibly find his turkey! You say to this corporation, we cannot authorize you to discount—to emit paper—to regulate commerce—no! our book has no precedents of that kind. But then we can authorize you to collect the revenue, and, whilst occupied with that, you may do whatever else you please." (3)

"What is a corporation, such as the bill contemplates? It is a splendid association of favoured individuals, taken from the mass of society, and invested with exemptions, and surrounded by immunities and privileges. The honourable gentleman from Massachusetts has said, that the original law, establishing the bank, was justly liable to the objection of vesting in that institution an exclusive privilege, the faith of the government being pledged, that no other bank should be authorized during its existence. This objection, he supposes, is obviated by the bill under consideration; but all corporations enjoy exclu-

sive privileges—that is, the corporators have privileges, which no others possess; if you create fifty corporations instead of one, you have only fifty privileged bodies instead of one. I contend, that the states have the exclusive power to regulate contracts, to declare the capacities and incapacities to contract, and to provide as to the extent of the responsibility of debtors to their creditors. If congress have the power to erect an artificial body, and say it shall be endowed with the attributes of an individual—if you can bestow on this object of your own creation the ability to contract, may you not, in contravention of state rights, confer upon slaves, infants, and females covert, the ability to contract? And if you have the power to say, that an association of individuals shall be responsible for their debts only in a certain limited degree, what is to prevent an extension of a similar exemption to individuals? Where is the limitation upon this power to set up corporations? You establish one in the heart of a state, the basis of whose capital is money. You may erect others, whose capital shall consist of land, slaves, and personal estate, and thus the whole property within the jurisdiction of a state might be absorbed by these political bodies. The existing bank contends, that it is beyond the powers of a state to tax it, and, if this pretension be well founded, it is in the power of Congress, by chartering companies, to dry up all the sources of state revenue. Georgia has undertaken, it is true, to levy a tax on the branch within her jurisdiction; but this law, now under a course of litigation, is considered invalid. The United States own a great deal of land in the state of Ohio; can this government, for the purpose of creating an ability to purchase it, charter a company? Aliens are forbidden, in that state, to hold land—could you, in order to multiply purchasers, confer upon them the capacity to hold land, in derogation of the local law? I imagine this will hardly be insisted on; and yet there exists a more obvious connexion between the undoubted power which is pressed by this government to sell its land, and the means of executing that power by increasing the demand in the market, than there is between this bank and the collection of a tax. This government has the power to levy taxes, to raise armies, provide munitions, make war, regulate commerce, coin money, &c., &c. It would not be difficult to show as intimate a connexion between a corporation established for any purpose whatever, and some one or other of those great powers, as there is between the revenue and the bank of the United States."

(4)

At the time Mr. Clay delivered this speech, the greatest part of the capital of the United States bank was owned by inhabitants

of Great Britain, and there was no security against its being perverted to evil purposes. The dangers to be apprehended from this condition of the institution were strongly portrayed in the following remarks :

"The power of a nation is said to consist in the sword and the purse. Perhaps, at last, all power is resolvable into that of the purse, for, with it, you may command almost every thing else. The specie circulation of the United States, is estimated by some calculators at ten millions of dollars, and, if it be no more, one moiety is in the vaults of this bank. May not the time arrive when the concentration of such a vast portion of the circulating medium of the country in the hands of any corporation, will be dangerous to our liberties? By whom is this immense power wielded? By a body who, in derogation of the great principle of all our institutions, responsibility to the people, is amenable only to a few stockholders, and they chiefly foreigners. Suppose an attempt to subvert this government—would not the traitor first aim, by force or corruption, to acquire the treasure of this company? Look at it in another aspect. Seven tenths of its capital are in the hands of foreigners, and these foreigners chiefly English subjects. We are possibly on the eve of a rupture with that nation. Should such an event occur, do you apprehend, that the English Premier would experience any difficulty in obtaining the entire control of this institution? Republics, above all other governments, ought most seriously to guard against foreign influence. All history proves, that the internal dissensions excited by foreign intrigue, have produced the downfall of almost every free government which has hitherto existed; and yet, gentlemen contend that we are benefited by the possession of this foreign capital!" (5)

REMARKS.

1. This power is rather more "vagrant" now than it was in 1811, and those who maintain it, including Mr. Clay himself, are more "vagrant" than the Hamiltons of 1791 or the Federalists of 1811. Hunt it out from the power to regulate commerce and it takes shelter under the power to coin money; drive it from that covert and you find it crouching under the power to lay and collect taxes; chase it from that hiding place and it resorts to the "slashes" of "the general welfare" in which every usurped power finds shelter from Democratic pursuit. What the Federalists of 1791 and 1811 were not bold enough to do, Mr. Clay fearlessly does now. Leaving all the specific grants of the constitution behind him, he advocates a National Bank as means of fur-

nishing a National paper currency, regulating exchanges and controlling the State Banks! Thus this "vagrant" power jumps out of the constitution altogether; for it is not pretended any power is granted by that instrument to establish a National paper currency, regulate the exchanges or control the State Banks. Mr. Clay and the Whigs of this day, out-federal the Federalists of former days as far as new converts outstrip in zeal those who have lived a life of piety and devotion.

2. No sound thinker can doubt, that the power to establish corporations is a *substantive* power if there be any such attached to sovereignty. In English law Books it is considered one of the highest attributes of sovereignty. That no such power is vested in Congress seems evident from the face of the constitution. That it was not intended to be granted, is proved by the Journal of the convention which shows that a proposition to that effect was directly negatived, and by the speeches of members which show that the power to establish Banks was discussed and rejected in that proposition.

But the argument is equally strong if we consider acts of incorporation of no more dignity than ordinary acts of legislation regulating the subject-matter to which they relate. Bank charters may be considered peculiarly of that character. To use his credit as a currency is a right which every man possesses in a state of society until restrained by law. The power to restrain its exercise, belongs to the States and not to the United States. The States have exercised the power we believe without exception, in their acts to prevent private banking. They have *taken away* a right which every citizen possessed, deeming its unrestrained exercise dangerous to society. They have, by the incorporation of Banks, *restored* that right to certain individuals under guards and limitations. The acts are in their essence, *acts to regulate the business of banking*, which in its character is as much a private business as trade, farming or the exercise of the mechanic arts, or the practice of the learned professions.

Can Congress pass an act to forbid private banking in the States? No man is yet bold enough to maintain such a proposition. When the States have forbidden the exercise of the right to every citizen, can Congress restore it? Can Congress

restore a right which the *States only* can take away? The proposition is an absurdity; yet it is affirmed in the establishment of a Bank of the United States, branching into the several States. Congress restores a right which Congress could not take away. Congress restores a right which the *States only* could take away. It is as far as it goes, the regulation of a *private business within the States*, as much so as if the incorporators were farmers or mechanics, Doctors or Lawyers. If Congress can take the 'business of banking out of the control of State authority *in part*, they may take it *in whole*. If they may establish a Bank of the United States, they may put down the State Banks. Indeed, that power is already assumed by the advocates of the Bank who want it as an instrument to control the State Banks; for a power to control is a power to destroy. And if Congress may thus assume power over one species of private business within the States, where is the assumption to end?

The Bank of the United States has justified Mr. Clay's allusion to the East India Company "which has subverted empires, and set up new dynasties, and has not only made war, but war against its legitimate sovereign." Our late Bank attempted, with Mr. Clay as its leader, to subvert the power of the President and Congress and set up a new dynasty subservient to its will, and made a war almost of arms against the government which gave it existence. "*We are in the midst of a revolution*" was the startling cry of its daring leader, Mr. Clay, when he called the Bank clans to the fight; and "there are no Sabbaths in revolutionary times" was the proclamation of the second in command, Daniel Webster, when he called on the people of Baltimore on the day of sacred rest to leave the worship of God for the service of the Bank. That the corporation was not successful in this attempt at revolution, is to be attributed, not to want of power adequate to the object on ordinary occasions, but to the invincibility of the chief whom it had to encounter. Many were the men who recoiled from the onset; but he who never knew fear, the man of the Hermitage, stood like a rock against which the waves dashed themselves into foam and disappeared.

It is melancholy to reflect, that the *Republican* of 1811 who then described this

"gigantic power," was the *Whig* of 1834 who did his utmost to verify his parallel!

Like the Mississippi Company too, our National Bank "menaced a total overthrow of all credit and confidence, and universal bankruptcy." Menaced? To a great extent it accomplished the object. While its war against the government was still raging, Banks began to stop payment and numerous bankrupts were announced in our cities. Vanquished in open warfare, it then resorted to a mode of attack more insidious and effective. With the funds it had called in during its war against the government, and with moneys borrowed at home and abroad, it commenced an unprecedented expansion which in a few months exceeded twenty millions of dollars. The State Banks followed the National Bank; and by their joint action, a scene of wild speculation was engendered scarcely equalled in the history of civilized man, which in the end buried the tempter and the tempted in a common ruin and produced a general prostration from which the country has not yet entirely recovered. Mr. Clay held it incumbent upon him to pass a bankrupt law to relieve from their debts those whom the policy of the Bank had tempted to their ruin; but he has not restored to a plundered people the millions of which they were robbed, nor replaced the fortunes of weeping widows and destitute orphans which were buried in the ruins of the Bank.

If our National Bank has not, like the East India Company, "carried dismay, desolation and death throughout one of the largest portions of the habitable globe," it has sowed the seeds of violence and crime throughout our broad land, and particularly in the city which was the seat of its power, which are now exhibiting their appropriate fruit in violence and crime, mobs and civil conflicts, bloody streets and burnt churches.

In the language of Mr. Clay we ask, "is it to be imagined, that a power so vast would have been left by the constitution to doubtful inference?"

3. This argument of Mr. Clay never has been and never can be satisfactorily answered, even by Mr. Clay himself. To receive government moneys, transfer and pay them out, was but a minute portion of the duties of the National Bank. Loaning money and dealing in exchanges for-

eign and domestic, were its principal business. Receiving and paying out deposits, whether public or private, was but a trifling affair comparatively. Those duties could be and are now performed for the government by its own officers and by the State Banks. Yet they are made a pretence for the exercise of a *creative* power. Congress *creates* a being complete in all its parts, endowed with vast business capacities of a private and general nature, that the government may employ it to perform some minute functions of its own. No power to *create* agents is conferred on the general government; it can only *employ* as its agents the beings which it finds created. The creative power, so far as it can be exercised by government, is vested exclusively in the States. The general government may *employ* in its *service* any natural or artificial persons it finds in existence; but it cannot *create* the one or the other. To *employ* is an incidental power; to *create* a substantial power; and to infer the latter from the existence of the former, is to invert the order of nature and of law, by placing the incident before the substance.

4. There is much of unanswerable argument and sound Democracy in these remarks; but alas! their author has lost sight of the one and abandoned the other! He has now no objections, to "a splendid association of favoured individuals;" none to conferring on them "exclusive privileges;" none to creating "an artificial body" with "ability to contract" "in contravention of state rights;" none to exempting "an association of individuals from responsibility for their debts only in a certain limited degree;" none to a precedent which, through corporations, may bring under the direct control of the general government, lands, slaves, personal estates, "the whole property within the jurisdiction of a state."

The exemption from state taxation which the Bank of that day asserted, the Bank of 1816 actually maintained. To arrive at that object, it overthrew the legislative and judicial authorities of the states, and by the United States Marshal, under the direction of Mr. Clay as counsel, entered the Treasury of Ohio, retook and replaced in its vaults a sum of money which had been collected from it as a state tax. Yes, the very man, who in 1811 declared "if

this pretension be well founded, it is in the power of Congress, by chartering companies, to dry up all the sources of state revenue," afterwards undertook for a fee to establish that pretension, and received, it is believed, the sum of TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS for his services! Thus was the Champion of state rights in 1811, the chief counsellor of the Bank in its successful effort to subvert them in 1818—21.

(5) How changed is Henry Clay on this point also! If a Bank of *eleven millions of capital* chiefly held by foreigners, excited such just alarm in 1811, what ought to have been the patriot's terror in 1832—4 when a Bank with *thirty five millions of capital* was openly struggling to obtain the mastery of the government? "Seven tenths of its capital," said Mr. Clay in 1811, "are in the hands of foreigners, and these foreigners chiefly English subjects." More than seven tenths of the Bank stock in 1834, "was held by foreigners, and these foreigners chiefly English subjects." Would it not have been just as easy for the English Premier to obtain "the entire control of this institution" in 1834 as it was in 1811? Yet in 1832—4 Mr. Clay had lost all terror of "foreign influence" and parrot-like repeated the old federal argument that "we are benefited by the possession of this foreign capital."

The capital of the Bank was then eleven millions. "By whom is this immense power wielded?" inquired Mr. Clay. "By a body who, in derogation of the great principle of all our institutions, responsibility to the people, is amenable only to a few stockholders, and they chiefly foreigners." This is the same Mr. Clay who in 1816 voted for a Bank of *thirty-five millions*, equally irresponsible to the people, and open to foreign Stockholders. The same Mr. Clay, who, in 1832, struggled for the renewal of its charter, although three-fourths of its stock had actually passed into the hands of foreigners; the same Mr. Clay who, in 1833—4, when Gen. Jackson struck his last fatal blow at the Bank Monster, then occupying a seat in the Senate, conspired with its managers to fill the country with alarm, distress, panic and fury, for the purpose of bending the government to its power, and forcing a renewal of all its privileges and immunities. "Perhaps at last," said Mr. Clay in 1811, "all power

is resolvable into that of the purse, for with it, you may command almost every thing else." How fearful were the elements which the Purse of the Bank commanded in 1834, with Clay and Webster at their head! "Suppose an attempt to subvert this government," said Mr. Clay, "would not the traitor first aim, by force or corruption, to acquire the treasure of this company?" What was the "revolution" which Mr. Clay announced in the session of 1833-'4, but "an attempt to subvert this government?" As Col. Polk truly said, the issue was, "A REPUBLIC WITHOUT A BANK, OR A BANK WITHOUT A REPUBLIC." Desperate was Mr. Clay's struggle, aided by the Purse of the Bank, to subvert the Republic; but there was one thing which the purse could *not* "command:" That was the means of swerving President Jackson from his fidelity to the Republic. Around him whose voice was never raised in battle but as the signal of victory, the friends of the Republic rallied, beat back the minions of the Bank, and saved our free institutions from the coils of the Anaconda which was ready to crush them.

And here comes Mr. Clay *again*, at the head of his corrupt host, proposing to reorganize the power which it was so difficult to destroy, enlarged to a capital of FIFTY MILLIONS. Again the issue is "A REPUBLIC WITHOUT A BANK, OR A BANK WITHOUT A REPUBLIC." If the people prefer "a Republic without a Bank," they will support JAMES K. POLK as President of that Republic, authorized to govern by the will of the people; if they prefer "a Bank without a Republic," they will support HENRY CLAY as the Viceroy of the Bank, authorized to govern by the power of the Purse.

There is no subject which so clearly illustrates Mr. Clay's change from Republicanism to Federalism as this of the Bank. It is not a change upon any question of doubtful policy; but it is a change upon constitutional principle and fundamental power. The very worst principles of Federalism are involved in this question—constructive powers, corrupting influences, subversion of popular will, encroachment on State rights, supremacy of the central power controlled by agencies not responsible to the people: These are a portion

of the heresies which Mr. Clay adopted in becoming the friend of a Bank. But that he or any other man who is not himself corrupt, and believes a majority of the people to be so, should think it safe, as a question of policy, to establish *another* National Bank while the moral stench of the dead Monster fills the whole land, is absolutely amazing! In the fact now proved by long experience, that the government can, with entire facility, collect, transmit, and pay out its revenues without such an agency, every constitutional *pretence* for it is removed; and in the facts that exchanges are now better regulated than they ever were during the existence of a Bank, and that our gold coin furnishes a National Currency perfectly convenient for the traveller, all valid *excuse* for the usurpation on the score of convenience, is effectually put to rest. Those who want a Bank *now*, must want it as an instrument to govern with, a facility to speculation, or as a pageant like the thrones and aristocracies of other countries, upon which the imaginations of so many weak mortals delight to dwell. There is nothing left which can recommend it to the good man, the republican or the patriot.

SLASHING.

The Whigs, and particularly the National Intelligencer, are much scandalized at our slashing the Mill Boy of the Slashes, and abuse us in good set phrases for our presumption. The *uncontested truth* of our charges is a sufficient defence for us with honest men: but we answer the Whigs who abuse us with the following article from the Mobile Advertiser, viz:

"The Whigs complain that the Democrats are handling the political and personal merits of Mr. Clay with too much freedom. All discussion that is not fulsome they pronounce slander. Especially do they abuse Amos KENDALL, for his scathing investigations of the acts of Mr. Clay's life and his political purposes. The National Intelligencer is particularly offended with Mr. Kendall for calling upon the Democrats to 'slash' the 'Mill-Boy of the Slashes,' and all the smaller press of Whiggery set up a chorus of horror at the idea of *slashing* Mr. Clay.

"Do they know, that the Democrats may, if they choose, plead Mr. Clay himself as authority for the word and the practice? In 1841, he justified the whole Whig machinery of fraudulent electioneering in 1840, as justified by the lawlessness of the Democrats. He called them 'pirates,' whom it was lawful to '*attack without ceremony,*' and '*cut and slash*' as hard as you please. These are his words, in reply to Mr. Buchanan :

"The Senator, however, not only tells us that they (the Whigs) hold all sorts of principles, but they were afraid to publish to the world any declaration of their sentiments. Now, I believe, it is a part of the law of nations, that *when war is made against PIRATES*, there is no need of the ceremonies of any formal previous declarations of war, but it is understood on all hands that you are at liberty to attack them without ceremony, and cut and slash as hard as you please."

"After this gentle invocation to his Whig supporters to 'CUT and SLASH' the Democracy as 'PIRATES,' without notice or ceremony, it becomes them mightily to complain that some Democrats are so destitute of meekness and submission as to talk about SLASHING the slasher. He will, nevertheless, get pretty well slashed by November, to the infinite horror, we doubt not, of those party idolators, who have no other thoughts or motives of action than those which tend to the personal adulation and aggrandisement of their chief."

IS THIS RELIGION?

A man professing Christianity and reputed to be moral and pious beyond reproach or suspicion, once characterized an act counselled and produced by another man as follows, viz.:

"Scenes of shocking violence."

"The blood of war shed in peace."

"An outrage on every principle of order and humanity."

"It sets the laws of God and the institutions of a Christian people at defiance."

"If this murderous act be not met, and firmly and fearlessly rebuked, by the frowns of public sentiment, on ourselves will abide much of the guilt of murder."

"Atrocious deeds of violence."

"Heaven-daring sin."

And that devout man said, "*the blood of the murdered, the tears of the bereaved, and the commands of a righteous God, call upon them [the people] now to speak, and bear their stern and indignant testimony against this heaven-daring sin.*"

Such was the language of the professed man of God.

A few short years rolled away and what did the world behold!

It saw this pious man hugging to his bosom the author and counsellor of this "shocking violence," of this shedding of "the blood of war in a time of peace," of this "outrage on every principle of law and humanity"—the gray headed and unrepentant advocate of a practice which "sets the laws of God and the institutions of a Christian people at defiance," whose "murderous spirit" the snows of three score and seven winters have not been sufficient to cool; of a man who in old age defends the crimes of earlier years and every now and then threatens to repeat the "atrocious deeds of violence" which crimsoned his youthful hands.

It not only sees this devout professor giving his friendship and confidence to the "heaven-daring" sinner, but *beuding his name*, his influence and his RELIGION to raise him to the high places of the government and put into his hands the destinies of this *Christian Republic*!

He punishes "this murderous spirit" by attempting to place the government under its control; he "*frowns*" upon "*these atrocious deeds of violence,*" by putting it in the power of the guilty to subject a nation to their dominion.

Who is this religious man, whose morals and motives are above reproach?

It is THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN.

Who is this "man of blood" whose acts he has denounced and then taken the actor to his bosom?

It is HENRY CLAY.

Henry Clay was the acknowledged adviser of William J. Graves in the murder of Cilley. He wrote the challenge and it was his advice which produced the result. When he knew the parties had gone to the field, he refused to inform the civil authorities that they might prevent a consummation of the crime.

The awful result roused up the moral and religious feelings of the country and produced a meeting at Newark, New Jersey, to which Mr. Frelinghuysen was invited. He returned the following response, viz.:

TRENTON, N. J., March 5th, 1838.

"Gentlemen—On my way to the cars for this place this morning, I received your note of invitation to attend a meeting of our fellow-citizens at Newark to-morrow evening, on the subject of the late duel at Washington. I sincerely regret that my professional duties here, will detain me from the meeting—for if ever an occasion called for an expression of the public feeling, the late scenes of SHOCKING VIOLENCE most solemnly demand it. Truly 'the blood of war has been shed in peace;' and this in high places and among the law-makers of our country."

THE LAW OF THE DUELLIST IS AN OUTRAGE UPON EVERY PRINCIPLE OF ORDER AND HUMANITY. IT SETS THE LAWS OF GOD AND THE INSTITUTIONS OF A CHRISTIAN PEOPLE AT DEFIANCE, and if this MURDEROUS SPIRIT be not met and firmly and fearlessly REDUKED, by the frowns of public sentiment, on OURSELVES will abide much of the guilt of MURDER. It can be checked and effectually repressed, whenever the people, true to their high duties, shall rise in the majesty of public opinion, and frown upon these ATROCIOUS FEEDS OF VIOLENCE; and the blood of the MURDERED, the tears of the bereaved, and THE COMMANDS OF A RIGHTEOUS GOD, call upon them now to speak, and bear their stern and indignant testimony against this HEAVEN-DARING SIN.

I hope, gentlemen, that your meeting and proceedings may exert a powerful influence, and with kindred demonstrations all over the land, prevail to crush this alarming evil.

Very respectfully,

THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN."

And we now see how such "people" as Mr. Frelinghuysen are "true to their high duties;" how they meet and rebuke "the murderous spirit," how they punish "the heaven-daring sin," how they obey "the commands of a righteous God!" THEY TAKE THE PRINCIPAL OFFENDER AND MAKE HIM PRESIDENT!! That is the way Mr. Frelinghuysen puts down "heaven-daring sins!"

And to help the Duellist along, he consents to run on the same ticket with him!!

We shall not call in question Mr. Frelinghuysen's religion; but it is of a kind we are unable to comprehend.

To place Mr. Frelinghuysen's *practical* religion on this point in a more imposing light, we annex a list of Mr. Clay's "Heaven-daring sins" which religious men are now called upon to *punish*—BY MAKING HIM PRESIDENT!

Henry Clay was born in 1777.

In 1805 he had a quarrel with Col. Davies, of Kentucky, and a duel was only prevented by the active interference of friends.

In 1808, he challenged Humphrey Marshall, of the Kentucky legislature. They met: three shots were exchanged, and both parties were slightly wounded, before the quarrel was settled.

In 1825, he challenged John Randolph, one of the purest statesmen the country ever saw. While he aimed his bullet at the heart of Randolph, that great man discharged his pistol in the air.

In 1838, he assisted in planning the murder of Jonathan Cilley, of Maine. He counselled with Graves, urged on the duel, and actually penned the challenge with his own hand.

In 1841, he insulted Mr. King of Alabama; a challenge was expected; the police of Washington city interfered, and he was compelled to give \$5,000 bonds to keep the peace, or go to jail. This bond has not yet expired.

But the whig leaders say these duels were fought when Mr. Clay was young, indiscreet and hot-blooded. Let us look at that a moment.

He was born in 1777.

1st duel in	1805,	when	28	years	old.
2d "	1808,	"	31	"	"
3d "	1825,	"	48	"	"
4th "	1838,	"	61	"	"
5th "	1841,	"	64	"	"

PRICE OF THIS TRACT—Two cents, single; \$1 per 100 copies; or \$5 for 600. Cash in hand.

Address Expositor, Washington, D. C.



0 009 746 167 3